

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Applicants originally submitted Claims 1-31 in the application. In previous responses, the Applicants amended Claims 1-3, 5, 11, 13, 19, 21, 27 and 29-31; cancelled Claims 9, 10, 14-18, and 22-26; and added Claims 32-43. In the present response, the Applicants amend Claims 1, 11, 19, 27, 29 and 32-43 and cancel Claims 8, 30 and 31 without prejudice or disclaimer. The claim amendments are supported, *e.g.*, by U.S. Patent No. 7,334,038 to Crow, *et al.*, column 2, lines 1-49, incorporated by reference in the instant application by operation of ¶¶ [0003] and [0007], and ¶ [0037]. New Claims 44 - 46 are presented for Examination. These claims are supported, *e.g.*, by FIG. 4-6 and associated description, *e.g.*, ¶¶ [0049]-[0060]. Accordingly, Claims 1-7, 11-13, 19-21, 27-29, and 32-46 are currently pending in the application.

### **I. Rejection of Claims 1, 4, 8, 11-12, 19-20 and 27-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 4, 8, 11-12, 19-20 and 27-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,790,796 by Sadowsky (hereinafter “Sadowsky”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,651,249 to Waldin, *et al.* (hereinafter “Waldin”). The rejection of Claims 8, 30 and 31 is moot, as these claims have been cancelled. With respect to the remaining claims, the Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Applicants respectfully assert that the references of record as applied in the Office Action do not teach at least one of the elements of the independent claims as currently amended. More specifically, the references as applied do not teach or suggest “an agent application configured to accept a service selected from the group consisting of a registration service, a profile data management service, a login service, an agent connection status service, a plug-in management service, a subscriber profile management service, a service point map service, a profile management

service, an administrative service, a data publishing service, an announcement service, and an agent configuration service” as recited in Claim 1. Claims 11, 19, and 27 as amended include similar claim elements.

Furthermore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the subject claim elements are allowable over Sadowsky and Waldin as these references are applied, at least because the recited services do not have obvious applicability to the methods disclosed therein. Sadowsky and Waldin are directed to software updating. (*See, e.g.*, Sadowsky Abstract; Waldin Abstract.) In contrast, Claims 1, 11, 19 and 27 are directed to various services in a distributed services network. An objective of software updating is uniformity of software revisions, *e.g.* But an objective of the disclosed distributed services network is customized configuration of client systems as a function of, *e.g.*, location. (*See, e.g.*, FIG. 6.) Such customizing is contrary to the uniformity of revision level typically desired in software update administration.

Accordingly, Claims 1, 11, 19 and 27 are allowable over the cited references. The remaining claims, depending from allowable base claims, are also allowable. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 1, 4, 11-12, 19-20 and 27-29 issued under § 103(a) and allow issuance thereof.

## **II. Rejection of Claims 2-3, 5-7, 13, 21 and 32-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 5, 13 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sadowsky and Waldin as applied to Claims 1, 4, 11-12, 19 and 23 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,112,323 to Meizlik, *et al.* (hereinafter “Meizlik”); as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of: U.S. Patent No. 6,986,134 to Foster (hereinafter “Foster”) for Claim 7; U.S. Patent No. 5,838,907 to Hansen (hereinafter “Hansen”) for Claim 6; U.S. Patent No. 5,920,725

to Ma, *et al.* (hereinafter "Ma") for Claim 2; U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0003390 to Canter, *et al.* (hereinafter "Canter") for Claim 3; and as applied to Claims 1, 11 and 19 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0088698 to Claiborne (hereinafter "Claiborne") for Claims 32-43. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As set forth above, independent Claims 1, 11, 19 and 27 are allowable over the references of record as applied by the Office Action. The remaining claims, depending from allowable base claims, are also allowable. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 2-3, 5-7, 13, 21 and 32-43 issued under § 103(a) and allow issuance thereof.

### **III. New Claims**

The Applicants respectfully submit that new Claims 44 and 45 each include at least one element that is not taught or suggested by the references of record. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner issue a notice of allowance for these claims.

#### IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicants now see all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-7, 11-13, 19-21, 27-29, and 32-46.

The Applicants request the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits or overpayments to Deposit Account 08-2395.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, P.C.  


David H. Hitt  
Registration No. 33,182

Dated: June 19, 2009

P.O. Box 832570  
Richardson, Texas 75083  
(972) 480-8800